


CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM

Office Memorandum

Date: August 7, 1996
To: Larry Rodriguez
Bookman-Edmonston Engineering Inc.
From: Victor Pacheco 
Subject: Review of draft storage/conveyance materials

The following is to document the comments expressed regarding the three draft products provided for review at the meeting on Tuesday August 6, 1996, and to offer additional suggestions based on further review.

General comments

The conveyance and storage elements should be referred to as components instead of alternatives to maintain consistency with other Program documents.

The references to Phase II Analysis should be replaced with language referring to the component refinement process. The component refinement process will refine definition of the ranges for subsequent impact analysis in Phase II.

Specific comments on Surface and Groundwater Storage Opportunities

The title for the Sacramento and tributaries section is missing.

The components should be organized in order by Groundwater/Conjunctive Use, Offstream storage, and then Onstream storage. In addition, each category should be organized in order by expanding existing facilities and then new facilities. I suggest this organization continue to be under the general area categories identified in the draft material (Sacramento, San Joaquin, In-Delta, etc...) Another suggestion is to arrange the elements by size within each grouping keeping in mind the few elements such as Auburn Reservoir which would raise concerns if shown at the top of any list.

Suggested headings for the columns: "Name of Component", "Location", and "Source of Information", "Size", and/or "Costs". The last three headings are suggested since the elements will be categorized by "type" and the current descriptions may not be needed or could be included with the name.

Additional information within the name may be helpful such as including the information currently within the "description". For example, Kern County, I assume, refers to the Kern Fan Element transferred from the State Water Project to the Kern County Water Agency?

Specific comments on Conveyance Opportunities

References to previous "alpha" alternatives should be removed particularly since we are looking for previous studies to provide more substantive information currently available within our alternative descriptions.

Providing "Capacity" and "Source of Information" may be useful. Combining the "name" and "description" columns could provide flexibility in providing additional information.

The Tehama-Colusa Canal Enlargement location/description if not consistent with current Program alternatives needs to clearly identify source of information.

The location for the "Sacramento Ship Channel Conveyance" identifies only the lower portion of the conveyance.

Inclusion of the "South Bay..." and "San Luis to ..." conveyance elements is inconsistent with the Program's objective to resolve Bay-Delta issues. The program is advocating solutions to ensure the Delta is not the bottleneck.

Specific comments on "Screening Ranking Process"

Categories 4 and 5 should be combined to reflect water supply opportunities for all beneficial uses.

An example of an element for conveyance or storage components in the attribute matrix would be helpful.

This process should NOT refer to impacts since this will be addressed in the Impact Analysis effort for Phase II. I suggest using the term "evaluation" or "assessment".

Perhaps using the term "compatibility" as opposed to "operation" clarifies the intent is to determine how effective the element is with other components of the Program alternatives.

Suggested revisions to "ranking criteria" include: Item 1 should be the Primary Criteria; Environmental Evaluation/Assessment, Water Supply Opportunity, and "Compatibility" should be First-level Criteria; Implementation Time, Costs, and Reliability should be Second-level Criteria. The language for the Environmental Evaluation/Assessment should be modified to reflect benefit/improvement over existing conditions.

Potential revisions to the criteria will require modifications to the weighting factors. I suggest using a simple process of placing a uniform weight for each criteria in the first level criteria and a lower uniform weight on the second level criteria. My suggestion is based on the difficulty we had in gaining wide acceptance of our "performance measures" used to evaluate our alternatives. Using the example in the draft materials illustrates that even with this simplified approach there are still potential difficulties:

Environmental Evaluation/Assessment	$3 \times 7 = 21$
Water Supply Opportunity	$4 \times 7 = 28$
Compatibility (assuming North of Delta)	$3 \times 7 = 21$
Implementation Time	$4 \times 5 = 20$
Costs	$5 \times 5 = 25$
Reliability (assuming offstream)	$4 \times 5 = 20$

TOTAL SCORE	135
-------------	-----

I have provided Dick Daniel a copy of the storage and conveyance materials for his review, but as I indicated in the meeting he will not be in the office until Wednesday afternoon. It may be helpful to provide him a clean copy of the ranking process by faxing it to his attention at 654--9780.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call me at 657-2666.

cc: Steve Yaeger
Ron Ott
Stein Buer